

Remarks

Claims 1, and 3 through 24 are pending. Claim 2 has been canceled, and claims 1, 12, 17, and 18 have been amended.

Initially, claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for including the term “preferably tiltable.” That term has been deleted without adding any new matter and it is believed that this rejection has been traversed.

The examiner has also objected to the drawings as they relate to claim 18, which recites a first and second energy routing chain. The examiner asserts that the drawings do not show a first and second routing chain. Applicants respectfully disagree because Fig. 5 includes items 32 and 33, which are identified in the specification at page 12, lines 6 and 33, for example. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that no amendments to the drawings are necessary and that there is no need to delete claim 18.

Claims 16, 20, and 21 were amended to correct obvious typographical errors, and no new matter has been added.

At page 4 of the office action, the examiner has indicated that claims 12 through 14, and 18 through 23 are objected to for depending from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent claim format. Claims 12 and 18 both had previously depended from claim 1, and both claims have been amended herein to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, these claims are believed to be in allowable form.

Further, claims 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 all depend directly or through an intervening claim from claim 12. Thus, these claims are believed to be allowable, as well. By this amendment, Applicants have added only two new independent claims so that there are only three

total independent claims. Therefore, no additional fees are believed to be owed as a result of this amendment.

Claims 1 through 6, 8 through 11, 15 through 17, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 10-220,533 ("JP '533"). The examiner asserts that JP '533 discloses all of the elements of these claims. Beginning on page 3 of the Action, the examiner lists a number of elements purportedly disclosed in JP '533, and specifically asserts that "gear contact (Fig. 5), is considered to be influenced by a frictional connection." Applicants respectfully disagree. A gear contact is the meshing of two mechanical components. That is not a frictional connection as recited in claim 2.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2, which is not disclosed by JP '533. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, with this limitation, is not anticipated by JP '533 or rendered obvious in view of JP '533 because there is no teaching in JP '533 to one skilled in the art to replace a meshed gear arrangement with an effective connection that is a frictional connection.


As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable as are its remaining dependent claims 3 through 11, 15, 16, 17, and 24.

Applicant: Jean Jack Worms
Application No.: 10/501,596

Conclusion

For the foregoing reason, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and that this case should be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,


Jerry W. Smith, Reg. No. 33455
Attorney for Applicant
SMITH LAW OFFICE
440 Science Drive, Suite 302
Madison, WI 53711
(608) 663-8200